

News- SOCIAL Letter ACTION

XIV, No. 4



Indianapolis, Indiana

April, 1950

Atomic Scientists Rip Veil of Secrecy

It is no secret that atomic scientists who developed the A-bomb have been acutely happy over the use made of their discoveries and the apparent determination of the Administration to exploit atomic energy primarily for military purposes. The President's announcement on January 31 that he had ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to produce the hydrogen bomb has added to their unhappiness. Up to now they have felt bound for security reasons to maintain a high degree of reticence about their work.

Since "the naive and monumental indiscretion" of Senator Edwin C. Johnson (Colo.), who when asked on a television program if there is not too much secrecy regarding atomic energy, replied that in his view there was not enough, and then proceeded to pull what many regard as the biggest boner made by any member of Congress in recent years when he said, "Now our scientists already have created a bomb as effective as the bomb dropped at Nagasaki, and they're not satisfied at it. They want one that has a thousand times the effect of that terrible bomb that snuffed out the lives of 50,000 people just like that. And that's the secret, the big secret — the scientists in America are so anxious to divulge."

Wittingly or unwittingly, Senator Johnson let the cat out of the bag. This was the link the scientists had been looking for. With the matter thus brought to light, President Truman made his January 31 announcement that he had ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to produce the hydrogen bomb.

Scientists Enlist the Press

Feeling that momentous decisions were being made without consulting the American people, the scientists decided to seek assistance of the newspapers of the nation to get their story to the public. The newspapers of March 20-26 carried a series of six stories prepared by the American Society of Newspaper Editors' Committee on Atomic Information in collaboration with the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, the monthly journal of the Federation of American Scientists, detailing their fears that the American people have not been told what the hydrogen bomb and other new weapons can do to man and to the world, and their fear that the American people are not deciding — they need, are not being given either the information or the opportunity to decide — how to behave in a world of such weapons.

The ASNE was brought into the picture when a representative of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* appeared in the office of the midwestern editor, chairman of ASNE's Committee on Atomic Information, with a set of sheets of the March issue of the *Bulletin*. Out of that conference came the decision to carry the fight to the people through a series of Associated Press arti-

Among the *Bulletin's* sponsors are Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission's general advisors and war-time chief of the Los Alamos Laboratories, who says, "The decision to seek or not to seek international control, the decision to try to make or not to make the H-bomb are issues . . . that which the very basis of our morality. There is grave danger in that these deci-

Foreign Policy in Travail

For some months the Administration in Washington has been under severe attack on its foreign policy. "We have no foreign policy," and "We are losing the cold war," are favorite charges — both with a large measure of truth in them. Yet for the first time since the end of the War the bare outlines of a positive policy have emerged in recent weeks.

A glance at some background may help us understand the present situation. Internal conflicts and contradictions began to show up during the War. One very significant instance — perhaps the basic one — was the dispute between the State Department and the Armed Forces over control of the conquered countries.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor the State Department set up an office, manned by outstanding specialists in all fields, to prepare policies and plans for controlling the axis peoples. At the same time the Armed Forces was operating a school for military government at the University of Virginia in preparation for taking over these peoples, the controlling policy of which was stated in the top-secret paper by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, known as JCS 1067. Although there was considerable cooperation between the two groups, the show-down came when the Armed Forces demanded authority over the State Department's operations. Unable to gain the support of the President for power commensurate with its responsibility as administrator of Germany and Japan, the State Department washed its hands of the whole thing. And thus it happened that in the case of the United States alone of the four occupying powers the policy-making agency became the military.

Gen. L. D. Clay, who was responsible for control of Germany, in his recent *Decision in Germany* states two most illuminating facts. One was that when he took over he did not know anything about the role of the State Department in relation to his job, did not talk to any one in the Department about it, and consequently made his own decision as to what to do about statements coming from this Department; viz, that they should come through the War Department and he would regard them as "suggestions."

More important, he reports that when he left Washington he knew nothing about JCS 1067 nor of the policies which had been agreed upon with the other occupying powers. That we have displayed confusion on decartelization, denazification, rearmanent and other matters is not surprising.

In the Far East confusion has stemmed from a somewhat different source. Here we sought restoration of the status quo ante bellum as against support of the rev-

Summer Study Opportunities

Each summer a number of study opportunities are available to ministers and church workers. Below are listed those announced to date.

Summer School of Alcohol Studies, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., eighth annual session begins July 8 and closes August 4. Consists of some 68 lectures by the leading authorities on alcohol addiction in the U.S., together with discussion groups, workshops and visual education programs. Open to ministers, religious educators, welfare workers, probation officers, and others engaged professionally in activities in which a knowledge of the problems of alcohol would be helpful. A limited number of scholarships are available. Write Department of Social Welfare, 222 S. Downey Ave., Indianapolis 7, Ind.

Summer School for Ministers on the Church and Economic Life, under the direction of the Federated Theological Faculties, University of Chicago, June 26 — July 29. Courses carry credit in University of Chicago. Enrolment limited to 35. Preference given to ministers serving in industrial areas. Write Department of Social Welfare, 222 S. Downey Ave., Indianapolis, Ind. for information and application forms. The Department is prepared to give limited assistance to selected individuals.

Workshop on Group Dynamics in the Life of the Church, July 3-21, offered by the Federated Theological Faculties, University of Chicago, under the direction of Prof. Ross Synder. Tuition \$50. For particulars write Prof. Ross Snyder, 5757 University Ave., Chicago 37, Ill.

Conference on the Church and War, Detroit, Mich., May 8-11. Called by a national committee headed by Albert Edward Day and 20 other well known religious leaders. Registration fee \$2. Address George M. Houser, Secretary, 252 Fulton Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.

SOCIAL ACTION NEWS-LETTER

Published monthly, except for joint July-August issue, by the Department of Social Welfare, The United Christian Missionary Society, 222 South Downey Avenue, Indianapolis 7, Indiana.

Subscription price \$1.00 per year.

Entered as second class mail matter September 2, 1943, at Indianapolis, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Staff

James A. Crain Walter W. Sikes
Mrs. Ruth Estes Milner

The opinions and points of view expressed in this publication are those of the editors and do not necessarily represent The United Christian Missionary Society.

Civil Liberties And Education

(Note: This is the substance of an address to the recent Washington Workshop by Dr. Richard Kennan, of the National Educational Association and vice-president of the Civil Liberties Clearing House.)

Anyone who attempts to discuss this subject could be very easily caught in as bewildering a situation as the albino sparrow that inadvertently flew over a playground and was mistaken for a shuttlecock in a badminton game . . . In the brief time allotted me I would like to make five main points concerning education and civil liberties. I will expect the panel and the entire group to bring out other key points in the discussion.

Point One. The schools must teach the youth of this country about civil liberties. The very future of our way of life depends upon the recognition, support and advancement of our fundamental rights. The right of no taxation without representation may seem like a distant and well won right to many people till we ask, "Where is the representation of those Americans who have no vote, and therefore no voice, in the selection of those who levy the taxes?" Basic rights are never permanently won. The modern counterparts of the Tories of our Founding Fathers are still at work to prevent the freedom of the common man. Unless the great majority of citizens are alert to the significance of our basic rights, those rights may be lost. The institution in the best position to each about our basic rights and responsibilities is the public school.

Point Two. Teaching about "civil liberties" may sound too passive. It is not so. Real teaching involves not mere reading and recital of facts but also includes demonstration and practice. Real teaching recognizes the importance of examples as well as precept.

Point Three. Many schools today are not giving adequate attention to civil liberties. In many areas, some of them uncomfortably close at hand, the matter of civil liberties is not merely neglected but is actually taboo. In some instances the schools may set an example of what is fundamentally wrong in the area of civil liberties. Witness the Regents of the State of New York issuing, under legislative compulsion, it is true, an edict that under the Feinberg Law a teacher may be dismissed who utters a "subversive word or words." I have been trying for some weeks to find an authority who will tell me what one

(Continued on page 4, col. 2)

Washington Round-up

Acheson's Berkeley Speech. One of the most significant foreign policy pronouncements of recent years was made by Secretary of State Acheson in Berkeley on March 16. Frankly discussing West-East tensions, Mr. Acheson pointed out seven areas where the Soviet Union might act to ease international tensions:

1. Five years after the end of hostilities the victorious allies have not been able to define the terms of peace. The U.S. is not prepared to accept terms that would make Germany, Japan, and Austria satellites of the Soviet Union. Germany can be unified under a government chosen in free elections under international observation. The Soviet Union could cooperate to draft a peace treaty for Austria. The Soviet Union could recognize the interests which nations other than members of the Foreign Ministers Council have in Japan and could act to relax tensions throughout the Far East.

2. The Soviet Union could withdraw its military and police forces from satellite countries and refrain from using "the shadow of that force" to keep unpopular regimes in power.

3. Soviet leaders could stop their policy of obstruction in the United Nations.

4. Soviet leaders could join us in seeking realistic and effective controls for atomic weapons and limitation of armaments in general. Here Acheson cleverly avoided reference to the Baruch plan and left the way open for discussion of other effective controls.

5. The Kremlin could refrain from using the Communist apparatus controlled by it throughout the world to attempt to overthrow by subversive means established governments with which Russia stands in outwardly friendly relations.

6. The Soviet government could cooperate with us to see that official representatives of all countries are treated everywhere with decency and respect.

7. Soviet leaders could refrain from systematic distortion of the picture of the world outside of their borders.

These points are not formulated as a one-sided bargain. If the Soviet Union would join us we could all face the future in greater security.

McMahon Proposal. On February 2, Senator Brien McMahon (D. Conn.) delivered a speech in the Senate in which he proposed that the U.S. spend ten billion dollars annually for the next five years on world reconstruction through the U.N. if effective international control of atomic

energy could be achieved coupled with an agreement that armament expenditures around the world be reduced by two-thirds and the money thus saved devoted to constructive ends. The speech attracted wide attention and Senator McMahon received 6,000 letters endorsing the proposal.

Tydings Proposes Disarmament. On February 6, Senator Millard Tydings (D. Md.) proposed universal disarmament by the nations "down to rifles." He introduced S.226, authorizing the President to call a conference for this purpose. On March 6 he introduced S.236, identical with S.226, except that it requests the U. N. to take the initiative instead of the President. Senator Tydings is reported as saying that never in his 23 years in the Senate has any proposal attracted so large a flood of approving mail. On March 15 it was reported that 10,000 letters had been received.

Draft Act to be Allowed to Die. The Selective Service Act of 1948 will be allowed to expire on June 30, according to reports. Only two calls were made under it, in December 1948 and January 1949, totaling 30,000 men. It is to be allowed to die because voluntary enlistments have provided all the men needed by the armed forces.

New Draft Act Proposed. Rep. Carl Vinson (D.Ga.) chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has introduced H.R. 7442 to take the place of the Selective Service Act of 1948 which, as indicated in the previous paragraph, will be allowed to die on June 30. The new bill, which has not yet come from committee, is to be called the Manpower Registration Act of 1950. It would register and classify for military service all males reaching the age of 18 years. The bill sets up a Selective Service System with the same powers as the Act of 1948, except that no inductions or training is authorized. Since it is a registration and classification measure, it could form the basis for drafting men not only for military service but also for other types of service. Its provisions for conscientious objectors are unsatisfactory to the peace agencies and efforts are being made to liberalize these provisions.

C.O. "Frozen Fund." The House rejected by a vote of 265 to 102, H.R. 5953 to appropriate \$1,229,240.61 earned by C.Os during the war to the CARE book program. Those who earned the money asked that it be used for this purpose.

DP Legislation. After a week of debate agreement was reached on March 8 to delay further action until March 31. The bill passed the House a year ago. Senator McCarran (D.Nev.) bottled it up in committee until forced to bring it out. He has not loaded it down with amendments. Meanwhile thousands of DPs face loss of opportunity to get to the U.S.

On Social Frontiers

Successor to Myron Taylor? Speculation is rife in Washington on the question of the appointment of a successor to Myron Taylor. This appointment, first made by President Roosevelt in 1939 on a "temporary" basis, has been condemned by protestants from the first. Now that Taylor has resigned the President is being urged to drop the Vatican representation. In Roman Catholic circles he is being more strongly pressured to send another representative and make him a regular ambassador. The State Department is expected to be opposed to such a move, feeling that the American ambassador in Rome can secure from the Vatican all the information needed. Catholics are said to be writing about 10,000 letters favoring Taylor, 300 opposing. In a political sense, with the huge Catholic vote in the country and the Administration under fire for harboring Communists, the temptation yielded to Catholic pressure will be very great.

* * *

What's Back of McCarthy? Who is the rising Senator ("Windy Joe") McCarthy in his attacks on the State Department? Drew Pearson on March 20 revealed that several months ago McCarthy interviewed a number of his friends as to the issues would be most likely to get him re-elected when his term expires in June. Various suggestions were made, including sponsorship of the St. Lawrence Seaway, which would benefit the North. But a Father Walsh of Georgetown University (McCarthy is a Roman Catholic) advised him that the Communist issue would get him a lot of attention. Republicans in Congress who were disposed to let McCarthy go his way and to get in behind him if he uncovered something, are beginning to feel that McCarthy has gone too far and that there is too little evidence to support his wild charges. He did not even appear to take the drubbing given him by Judge Florio Kenyon, the first person to be attacked by him. His Republican colleagues also feel that he is hurting U.S. foreign relations at a time when the nation can ill afford it. McCarthy is now in difficulty and Democrats seem willing to give him all the rope he needs to hang himself.

* * *

Steel Profits and Prices. When the recent Steel strike was settled by granting the Union's demands, U.S. Steel set the pattern by raising the price of steel \$4 a ton. The action was widely condemned as unjustified, but President Benjamin Franklin replied that it was necessary to enable the company to remain in business. In mid-March a joint Senate house committee reported that the price increase was "untimely" and "unwarranted." The report was almost immediately folded by U.S. Steel's annual report, showing that its profits, \$165,908,829, were the highest since 1929.

25,000,000 Africans Threaten Revolt

In a special interview given to C. L. Sulzberger of the *New York Times* in Cairo, Egypt on March 12, Abd el Krim, Emir of the Riff and president of the National Liberation Committee of North Africans, declared that 25,000,000 inhabitants of Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia are prepared to rise in violent revolt unless they receive complete independence. He said that 5,000,000 are now prepared to bear arms and that if the order were given mass desertions of native troops from the Spanish and French armies would take place.

Abd el Krim led the revolt of the Riff against Spain and later against France from 1922 to 1926. Forced to capitulate, he was sent by the French as a prisoner to Reunion Island. In 1947 the French permitted him to return with the idea of using him as a counter to the Sultan of Morocco, but at Port Said he walked off the ship and was given refuge by King Farouk of Egypt.

"The situation in North Africa is desperate," said the Emir. "France and Spain have covered it with an iron curtain 100 times stronger than that in Eastern Europe. There are no political rights nor civil liberties. We are not permitted an uncensored press. We are not permitted to travel, to form free trades unions, to vote openly for men we want. All our appeals have failed. None but a violent solution is in sight. We would be ready to guarantee the economic positions of France and Spain if they acknowledged our independence. Why cannot they recognize the failure of an antiquated colonial system? One by one other colonial powers like England and the Netherlands have seen the new day. If the French could understand the realities and change their 'Union' into something truly like the British Commonwealth they could save the situation. . . . In 1946 Ho Chi Minh went to Paris as a non-Communist nationalist and asked the French to change their attitude, warning that otherwise he would fight. He was not listened to. He was pushed into the Communists' arms and now depends upon their aid."

Continuing, Abd el Krim said, "If we go to war against France and Spain we will depend on our own efforts, but in a critical situation we will accept support from any quarters, even the Soviet Union."

To match the dangerous situation in North Africa, Prof. Rayford Logan, of Howard University, perhaps the best authority in the U.S. on native African affairs, told the Washington Workshop on March 15, that an influential native leader has announced his determination to set up a Socialist Soviet Republic in Southwest Africa. The long smoldering Dark Continent is about to break into open revolt. Is the U.S. prepared to use A-bombs and H-bombs to guarantee French and Spanish colonialism?

J.A.C.

Foreign Policy In Travail

(Continued from page 1, col. 3)

olutions already in process toward nationalism and self-government. As a result we were defeated in China, and discredited in Indochina and Malaya. We may overcome this handicap if the emerging policy actually comes into being and finds adequate implementation.

In the meantime, during 1946 to 1948 the policy of "containment," was articulated — a negative policy of curbing the expansion of Russia. This policy governed all our action in foreign affairs and many in domestic affairs until late 1949. One noble effort was made in 1948-49 to supplement this negative policy with a positive one — the Marshall Plan. But this was quickly converted to a tactic in the cold war, first by Russia's repudiation of it and then by the necessity of persuading Congress that it was an anti-Russian program.

The last days of 1949 saw this wall of containment breached in two places — China and atomic weapons. With these gains in the hands of Russia, particularly in view of what these portend, our failure became tragically obvious.

The first step toward an aggressive policy was taken by the President in his inaugural address, when he proposed what is now called Point Four — technical assistance to needy peoples to "help them realize their aspirations for a better life." A second step was the declaration of Secretary Acheson that our policy toward Communist China would continue to be non-intervention, self-determination, and friendship. A third has been the undeclared but obvious pressures we are putting on France and the puppet government of Indochina to move rapidly toward genuine freedom for Viet Nam — a step somewhat compromised by the appearance of naval vessels along the coast of Indochina.

The fourth step was taken March 15 by Secretary Acheson, when he declared support for the peoples who are seeking national independence, freedom, and economic improvement, reminding them that this kind of a revolution gave us our national existence. This, we may believe, is part of Acheson's earlier declaration that we must create a "situation of fact" vis-a-vis Russia; for it is in these areas that Russia obviously hopes to win the definitive advantage. The tragedy is that the State Department is now under such fierce and often irresponsible attack that it is doubtful whether it can command sufficient support for a policy that will win the one-third of the world in Asia and Africa whose decision will probably determine the outcome of the struggle.

W.W.S.

Atomic Scientists Rip Veil of Secrecy

(Continued from page 1, col. 2)

sions have been taken on the basis of facts held secret . . . The relevant facts could be of little help to an enemy. Yet they are indispensable for understanding questions of policy." Dr. Eugene Rabinowitch, editor of the *Bulletin* and a physical chemist at the University of Illinois, says "It was bad enough that the decision first to build and then use the original A-bomb had been made by a few persons in high positions and shrouded in secrecy. The nation as a whole is carrying the burden of responsibility for these steps, and generations to come may have to suffer their consequences." Dr. Harold C. Urey, University of Chicago professor whose discovery of heavy hydrogen made the H-bomb possible, thinks Senator Johnson has done the country a very great service in breaking the seal of secrecy. "Quite unwittingly," says Dr. Urey, "he has brought to the attention of the people of the United States a problem which should have been considered by them a very long time ago." In this he is supported by the majority of the 1,500 members of the Federation of American Scientists.

Questions for Americans

Americans must be given the opportunity, say these scientists, to decide whether and under what conditions they want to embark on this course. Some of the issues they must decide are:

1. Have Americans squared with their consciences the moral implications of making a weapon that can wipe out a huge city? A bomb 1000 times as powerful as the A-bomb would destroy an area of 530 square miles. A group of 12 scientists warned on February 4 that the H-bomb "is no longer a weapon of war but a means of extermination of whole populations. Its use would be a betrayal of all standards of morality and of Christian civilization itself . . . no nation has a right to use such a bomb no matter how righteous its cause."

2. Have Americans weighed the relative merits of super-bombs, A-bombs, guided missiles, radar nets, air groups and anti-sub fleets? We cannot afford all at once.

3. Have Americans decided whether or not to disperse at least some of their cities — a staggering project that will entail the moving of 30 to 60 million people and cost \$15 to \$25 billion a year for 10 years?

4. Have the American people decided that the "time is not ripe" to seek direct negotiations with Russia? President Truman has refused all suggestions from his own party and the Republicans to make a bold effort to reach agreement with the Russians.

5. If the time is not ripe to make such an effort have the American people decid-

ed how much of their resources, sovereignty and living standards they are willing to sacrifice to build weapons and bolster anti-Communist governments until our strategic position is equal or superior to that of Russia?

These are questions to which answers must be given. Indeed, they are questions to which answers are already being given by those in authority without consulting the American people. President Truman has said that he and he alone gave the word for the dropping of the A-bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. He has also said that he and he alone assumes responsibility for giving the word to go ahead with the manufacture of the H-bomb. The big question is, Is President Truman, or any single individual wise enough to make so momentous a decision without consulting the American people? It is this "Iron Curtain" of secrecy that Senator Johnson penetrated and the atomic scientists have ripped wide open. Americans who are concerned about their own future, the future of their families, of their country and the world should begin to tell their Senators and Congressmen their answers to the above questions.

Civil Liberties And Education

(Continued from page 2, col. 1)

word is subversive! And we find schools like one in Ohio that this month consolidated several smaller schools but keeps one room with four grades of Negro children with a Negro teacher — segregation within a school building.

Point Four. The principal inhibiting factor (not the only one) is the prejudice of the community. Many times the schools would like to make a contribution to the understanding of civil and human rights, but the community, or at least, active groups in the community make such violent protest that they are prevented from doing so. For example, look to the New York Board of Education abolishing in-service courses in the field of intercultural education, allegedly at the behest of the *Brooklyn Tablet* (a Roman Catholic publication - ed.) which claimed that "intercultural" education had become a Communist term. Or look to the commotion and fear developed among teachers in the District of Columbia when the most conservative of civic textbooks is attacked for the reason that it contains a picture of Stalin and that it says that a battleship costs several million dollars and raises the question of how many schools could be built for the cost of one battleship, the latter being considered an attack on our national defense. The schools are not going to be able to do a better job of preparing citizens who recognize and appreciate our essential rights and responsibilities unless the community permits and encourages them to do so.

Point Five. You are the community, or

at least an important factor in the community. It is too easy for us to regret that nothing more is done. But it is not a job to let "George" do — it is the responsibility of every American everywhere — including particularly prominent and influential members of the community like you here tonight. The schools can do a better job of helping to defend and advance civil liberties if you do your part. What is being done in the school nearest your home? Are the teachers afraid to allow discussion of controversial issues? Are the teachers permitted to participate in election campaigns? Is the pattern of discrimination deepening or lessening?

These are not matters of your neighbor's children — these are matters of your responsibility and mine for the welfare of the community and the nation in the months and years ahead. These are matters which will determine whether or not we lose or maintain or advance the cause of civil liberties and basic human rights.

Taylor Vatican Mission Called Disservice

The New York office of the World Council of Churches has issued a 27-page report entitled "Relations Between the Ecumenical Movement and the Vatican in the Twentieth Century," reviewing the many approaches made to the Vatican by the leaders of the Ecumenical Movement, and particularly, the activities of Mr. Myron Taylor, President Truman's personal representative to the Vatican prior to the Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council of Churches in August 1948.

The report reviews the approaches made to the Vatican through the years. These were always rebuffed by the Roman Church authorities, though "unofficial observers" have been present in several world conferences, including Amsterdam.

Blunt language is used in describing the activities of Mr. Taylor, who attempted to have invitations issued to Roman Catholic representatives despite the fact that the Vatican, though duly notified of the meeting, had not asked to be represented. Mr. Taylor also, says the report, suggested that Moslems be included, ignoring the fact that is was distinctly a Christian movement. The report reveals further that Mr. Taylor attempted to have himself invited to the Assembly as a representative of the U. S. Government, the only official of any government to make such a request. It was pointed out to him that was a conference of churches and that the World Council "could not in any manner recognize representatives of government, either before, at, or after the Assembly." The document, issued to dispel "widespread and persistent misrepresentations," characterizes Mr. Taylor's activities as a "disservice done to the interests of Protestant and Orthodox communions . . . based on incredible misunderstanding of the facts."

J.A.C.